

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested. Claims 1, 3-11, 13-21 and 23-30 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 11 and 21 being the independent claims. Independent claims 1, 11 and 21 are sought to be amended. The amendments introduce no new subject matter and their entry is respectfully requested. Based on the above amendments and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office Action dated April 16, 2008, all of the pending claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,475,683 to Harrison *et al.* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,369,841 to Co *et al.* Applicants respectfully traverse.

Neither Harrison nor Co teach or suggest a method or system for automatically establishing a new wireless coverage cell when a previously undetected repeater is coupled to a switch. Harrison is directed to improved roaming by mobile stations, especially where the mobile station moves from site areas covered by one multi-site switch network to an adjacent multi-site switch network. (Harrison, 4:38-41.) Previous systems required that the mobile station be pre-programmed with relevant site information for both networks. (Harrison, 4:10-18.)

The improvement taught by Harrison involves providing each mobile station—*i.e.*, a “radio” in Harrison—with a “small, reprogrammable personality memory for storing the current relevant adjacency information given the roaming radio’s present

location....” (Harrison, 4:50-55.) The “adjacency ‘list’ or ‘table’ is continuously updated by adjacent site control channel messages received from the current site as the radio roams from site to site and from multisite switch to multisite switch.” (Harrison, 4:55-59.) Harrison’s roaming system “permits digitally trunked radio transceivers [*i.e.*, mobile stations] to roam over an extended coverage area including two or more digitally trunked radio frequency communication networks.” (Harrison, 12-15.) The mobile stations control the roaming by “select[ing] a new repeater site when the fidelity of communications received from a currently selected repeater site is less than that received from repeater sites included in the transceiver’s site adjacency list.” (Harrison, 5:31-34.)

Nowhere does Harrison teach or suggest “*detecting, at a switch, a notification signal from a previously undetected first repeater coupled to the switch at a location;*” nor does Harrison subsequently teach or suggest establishing “*a new wireless coverage cell*” at the previously undetected repeater as recited in independent claims 1, 11 and 21.

The above defects in Harrison are not cured by Co. Co is directed to a “dual-speed stackable repeater with internal bridge for cascading or speed-linking.” (Co, Title.) Co does not teach or suggest automatically establishing a new wireless coverage cell when a previously undetected repeater is coupled to a switch.

In sum, neither Harrison nor Co teach or suggest the feature of automatically establishing a new wireless coverage cell when a previously undetected repeater is coupled to a switch. This feature is recited in each of the pending independent claims 1, 11 and 21. For this reason, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of independent claims 1, 11 and 21 be reconsidered and withdrawn. Further, Applicant requests that the rejections of dependent claims 3-10, 13-20 and 23-30 be reconsidered and withdrawn as they depend from independently patentable base claims and in view of

their own respective features. Claims 31-44 have been cancelled, thereby rendering their rejection moot.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Jon E. Wright
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 50,720

Date: August 18, 2008

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

861999_1.DOC